DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 354 JC 760 [illegible]9

AUTHOR Segalla, Angelo
TITLE A Quasi-Critical Analysis of the Status and Effectiveness of the Faculty Fellowship Program at Golden West College, 1969-1975.
INSTITUTION Golden West Coll., Huntington Beach, Calif.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Curriculum Development; *Faculty Fellowships; Financial Support; *Incentive Grants; *Instructional Innovation; *Junior Colleges; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Developed Materials
IDENTIFIERS Golden West College

ABSTRACT

The Faculty Fellowship Program at Golden West College (California) provides an annual fund to support faculty in implementing innovative methods of instruction. Since 1969, 401 proposals have been reviewed, and $316,287 has been allocated to 189 projects (47 percent). This report presents an objective overall picture of the program and provides an analysis of its effectiveness based on available data, consisting primarily of the opinions of the faculty members involved. The strengths and weaknesses of the program are discussed and recommendations for program improvement are made. Among the recommendations are the following: (1) since the same instructors and the same divisions seem to be receiving all the funding, new people and new divisions should be encouraged to apply; (2) team participation on fellowships should be encouraged; (3) after completion, fellowship projects should be constantly revised; and (4) every fellowship project should be accountable for a periodic progress report, completion report, and an evaluation report. The questionnaire used to solicit faculty opinions and a selection of project objectives are appended. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115354

A QUASI-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE STATUS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM AT GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE, 1969 - 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANGELO SEGALLA
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT FOR RESEARCH
GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE

1975

JC 760 029

INTRODUCTION

In 1969, the Board of Trustees of the Coast Community College District established a policy which set up an annual fund to support faculty on implementation of innovative methods of instruction. In its six years of existence, $316,287 has been awarded, 401 proposals were reviewed, and 189 were funded (47%). The Faculty Fellowship Program has produced an astounding amount of innovative software. Final products range from major revisions in course presentation (geology, biology, math, English, health science, anatomy physiology, business) to simple test construction (credit by exam for certain mathematics courses).

But for several years now, a need has been expressed by the District and college administrations to account, in some way, for the status and effectiveness of the Faculty Fellowship Program. Some efforts to give an accurate account have been attempted by the Office of Educational Planning and Development as well as the Office of Instructional Development on the GWC campus. Both, however, offered no more than a general summary of the number, time, and financial allotment of the fellowships granted during the past six years. Failure to give an in-depth analysis is not a reflection of lack of effort expended by these offices. The fact is that it's difficult, if not impossible, to compile the type of information needed to carry out an in-depth evaluation. A data-gathering system was not set up upon inception of the program. The planners of the Faculty Fellowship

Program wanted to get the program off the ground; evaluation designs were shunned in order not to discourage faculty from participating. This plan worked very well; as mentioned, faculty have produced, on the whole, an enormous amount of innovative and diversified approaches to learning. Perusal of just the available data indicates that no formal evaluation is needed to conclude that the Coast Community College District has gotten a whale of a bargain for its investment. Nevertheless, a formative evaluation that accounts for strengths and weaknessess may lead to a better program. I believe this is the goal Chancellor Watson had in mind when he called on the two research offices to conduct a "critical analysis" of the Faculty Fellowship Program in the September 17, 1975, memorandum:

> As a result of our meeting today, $20,000 is being allocated to each Dean of Instruction on a one-time experimental basis for development purposes.
>
> I am requesting that the administrator in charge of research on each campus make a critical analysis of all faculty fellowship projects approved thus far and prepare a report on their effectiveness.
>
> I am also requesting that Dr. Luskin chair a committee consisting of Hayden Williams, Leo Lajeunesse, Joyce Smitherin, Angie Segalla, and Sam Peterson to give consideration to the suggestions made during today's meeting and develop recommendations for modifications.
>
> The Faculty Fellowship program will be suspended for the fall semester during this review.
>
> We will plan to meet again during the latter part of October to consider recommendations.

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

The analysis in this report is both descriptive and qualitative. First an objective, overall picture of the program is given (e.g., number of fellowships per division). Then, in as meaningful way as possible and using the available data, an analysis of the effectiveness of the program is presented based primarily on the opinions of the instructors involved in the program--the only meaningful source of information available in this retrospective study.

The following sources of information were used to compile the report:

A. District summary data on the Faculty Fellowship Program (memorandum 9/2/75, B. Luskin, Appendix 1)

B. GWC faculty fellowship status report (Office of Instructional Development, Appendix 2)

C. Frequency of use data from Media and Computing Centers

D. Faculty fellowship questionnaire (sent to all recipients, Appendix 3)

E. Personal interviews with instructors and students

A, B, and C formed the basis of the descriptive part of this report; D and E were used to describe the effectiveness of the program.

Table 1 displays the number of fellowships applied for, approved, the number of instructors, amounts and averages. Roughly, half the instructors, number of fellowships, and amounts applied for were funded. However, many rejected proposals were subsequently re-submitted in changed format and approved (see Appendix 8).

TABLE 1

Golden West College breakdowns of amounts, number of instructors, and fellowships involved in the Faculty Fellowship Program, 1969-1975.*

		AMOUNT	NUMBER OF INSTR	AVG AMT PER INSTR	NUMBER OF FELLOW	AVG AMT PER FELLOW
GWC	APPLIED	429,964	149	2,886	189	2,275
	APPROVED	211,361**	76**	2,781	101	2,093

* Not shown is a joint fellowship carried out by OCC and GWC (library)

** Figures provided by District for GWC were found to be in error and have been corrected.

The response to this program by the GWC faculty was immediate. Numerous innovative ideas were implemented and quickly brought the college in the limelight of non-traditional education--often at the national level. Equipped with a youthful hard working faculty, and a supportive administration, Golden West College proved fertile soil for the Faculty Fellowship Program. More specific reasons for the success of the program are as follows:

1. At the inception of the Fauclty Fellowship Program, GWC faculty were already attuned to proposing non-traditional methods of education via the existing SAL summer projects.

2. The organizational structure by which fellowships were submitted was efficient: Faculty members had a clear cut path in submitting fellowship applications.

3. The fellowship proposals were well organized for presentation to District.

4. GWC faculty has been more than willing to pursue non-traditional methods of presentation.

5. Many of the GWC faculty fellowships were designed along ambitious lines. The biology, math, English, nursing, chemistry, geology, and physical science audio-tutorial labs and the Golden Keys and Shorthand West labs were complete revampings of existing courses. Fellowships in these areas were awarded roughly $100,000, one-half the total funding for all GWC fellowships.

One hundred eighty-nine applications were submitted by GWC instructors during the six-year period of Fall, 1969, to Spring, 1975. One hundred one were funded (53%). Seventy-six instructors on the GWC campus worked on fellowship programs; Appendix 4 lists the people involved.* Thirty-one instructors (47%) worked on more than one fellowship. Of these, 17 worked on 2, 12 worked on 3, and 2 faculty members worked on 5 faculty fellowships. Table 2 displays the yearly amount, number of instructors, and fellowships approved.** Note that

---

* District figures erroneously report 100 faculty involved. Evidently some faculty were counted twice.

** Because of the complexity of the budgeting and recording system used to account for fellowship funds, these figures should be allowed (not more than) a 3% tolerance. For example, the funds of several incomplete projects were terminated and absorbed into budgets that defy tracing.

column 3, Number of Instructors, is not summable since there are duplicates. Seventy-six different instructors involved.

Of the 101 fellowships funded, 80 were awarded to a single faculty member. Twenty were awarded to teams of two instructors, and one fellowship had three instructors working on it. No fellowships involved more than three instructors (see Table 3).

TABLE 2

Yearly amounts, number of instructors and fellowships approved from 1969 to 1975

YEAR	AMOUNT	NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS	NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS
1969	16,825.60	13	11
1970	34,350.95	21	18
1971	32,244.10	22	20
1972	22,308.00	16	14
1973	23,613.00	13	11
1974	50,658.00	22	18
1975	31,361.00	13	9
TOTALS	$211,360.74	76	101

TABLE 3

Number of instructors working on the 101 fellowships

NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS	NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS INVOLVED
80 Fellowships	1 Instructor Alone
20 Fellowships	2 Instructors
1 Fellowship	3 Instructors

These figures point out a weakness in the program. When only one instructor is involved in the execution of a fellowship, the completed project will tend to meet only his objectives for a course or program. These are not necessarily the same as those of his or her colleagues in the same discipline. The danger here is not only that horses are pulling the cart in different directions, but student use of the final product is greatly diminished.

Another way of looking at the data is as follows: Twenty-three fellowships involved instructors who participated only one time. The remaining 78 fellowships were worked on by faculty members involved in the program two or more times. That is, over three-quarters of the faculty fellowships involved "repeaters." This has been criticized by other faculty members: "The same people seem to be approved time after time." Thus, previous experience in the program seems to help funding. The implication is that only certain types of programs with the same group of people working on these programs are funded.

Criticism has also been voiced as to the number of fellowships awarded per division and discipline. Table 4 presents the breakdown by division of instructors involved, number of fellowships, amounts, averages, and ranks.

TABLE 4

Divisional breakdown of instructors, fellowships, amount, averages, and rank

DIVISION	# OF FELL	RANK	# OF DIF INST	RANK	AMOUNT	RANK	AVG AMT PER FELLOW	RANK	AVG AMT PER INST	RANK
Communications	18	2	13	2	$19,107	4	$1,062	9	$1,500	7
Social Science	7	7	6	6	10,158	7	1,451	7	1,400	8
Math/Science	35	1	22	1	89,283	1	2,551	3	4,058	1
Technology	8	5.5	7	5	15,840	5	1,980	5	2,100	5
P. E.	1	9	1	8.5	2,811	8	2,811	2	2,811	3
Health Sci	10	4	9	4	21,712	3	2,171	4	2,300	4
Business	12	3	10	3	38,631	2	3,219	1	3,863	2
F & A Arts	8	5.5	6	7	12,260	6	1,533	6	2,010	6
Special Ed	1	9	1	10	1,316	9	1,316	8	1,316	9
Library	1	9	1	8.5	135	10	135	10	63	10

Clearly, the Math/Science Division ranks first in funding with $89,283. This is almost as much as all other divisions put together (42% of the total funding). The Business Division is ranked second and Health Science third followed by the other divisions as displayed. In terms of the number of fellowships awarded and number of instructors involved, again the Math/Science Division is first.* A look at the average amount of funding per instructor and per fellowship reveals that instructors in the Math/Science Division were funded more on the average than instructors in other divisions. However, the amount awarded per fellowship favors the Business Division. Seemingly, Math/Science has been the most active, has received the most funding, but yet has shown good cost efficiency in the pursuit and execution of faculty fellowships.

*The number of Instructors column includes duplicates.

TABLE 5

DISCIPLINE	NUMBER OF INSTRUCTORS	NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS	AMOUNT
Mathematics	13	10	$ 25,453.00
English	18	12	22,504.78
Nursing	10	9	21,712.19
Biology	6	5	16,485.00
Shorthand West	3	2	14,561.00
Golden Keys	3	4	13,345.00
Geology	3	1	10,823.00
Anatomy/Physiology	4	1	10,585.00
Graphic Art	4	2	7,938.00
Chemistry	4	4	7,879.00
Art	3	3	6,746.00
Technology	3	3	6,103.10
Science Tech	1	1	5,881.00
Accounting	3	4	4,934.00
Physics	2	2	4,666.00
Music	4	3	4,561.50
Social Science	4	4	4,532.00
Duplicating Lab	1	1	3,990.00
Philosophy	2	2	3,908.00
Physical Science	2	1	3,268.00
Physical Education	1	1	2,811.00
Economics	2	1	1,800.00
Auto Tech	1	2	1,798.00
Special Education	1	1	1,315.85
Film	1	1	552.00
Library	1	2	135.00
TOTALS	100	82	$208,687.42

It is revealing to look at the Number of Instructors and Amount Granted by Discipline. Mathematics, English, typing and duplicating, and nursing have by far the largest involvement of faculty and amount of support. Are disciplines in some divisions more amenable to non-traditional methods? That is: Is it easier to create an audio-tutorial laboratory for biology than for history? For mathematics than psychology? If there is a need to balance this state of affairs, then representation from other divisions, disciplines, and instructors ought to be encouraged by future policy.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

In order to gain a perspective on the effectiveness of the Faculty Fellowship Program, we sent out 119 questionnaires to the 76 faculty members involved. The reason for the higher number of questionnaires is that a large portion of faculty members were involved in more than one project. Thus, two instructors could report the same fellowship. Even though we followed up the questionnaire with a written reminder and a phone call, the return rate was not spectacular, only 68 questionnaires were returned. Some questionnaires were not returned for good reason--recent fellowships (1975) are just beginning and some of the older ones are still in progress. Others were not returned for no good reason. The telephone follow-up indicated that, in general, people in the latter group felt that the

amount of time involved in filling out the questionnaire infringed on their other obligations. One faculty member simply said, "I threw mine away." A check of the status of the fellowships done by people who did not return a questionnaire shows that 11 do not have a final report or progress report on file either. This implies that even though some of the questionnaires were not returned, projects have been completed and are in various stages of operation. But, we do not have an idea as to the effectiveness or the impact on students these projects are having.

Prior inquiries into the status of faculty fellowships have been made by the Office of Educational Planning and Development at the District and the Office of Instructional Development on the Golden West College campus. Poor returns were experienced by both these offices, as well, and have made their efforts to analyze the program difficult. However, some faculty members expressed that too many inquiries were made. I suggest that a line be drawn at this point in time regarding further inquiries into the status and efficiency of the fellowships granted.

Before the Faculty Fellowship Program is reinitiated, a reporting system and formal evaluation should be implemented that will help answer questions of concern to the District, college, and faculty member in charge. The design need not be a threatening statistical paradigm which might discourage innovative ideas from being carried to fruition. Rather, a simple evaluation design based, perhaps, on the instructor's own method should be implemented but in

such a way that will assure a final report and an estimation of the effectiveness of the project. I further suggest that the emphasis of this final report be not on cost effectiveness but on "instructional effectiveness."

We did not attempt to analyze in detail and rate each individual project. This would have been a nearly impossible (if not presumptuous) task. For to properly rate each project would entail accounting for years of grade patterns, retention rates, effective student evaluations, etc.--all variables the control of which has been lost with lapse of time and the embeddedness of the projects into courses and programs.

The questionnaire sent to the instructors (see Appendix 3) was essentially divided into four broad categories. The first dealt with the effectiveness of the program based on achievement of objectives, desired impact, attitude, retention rate, number of students involved, length of use, and an opinion from the faculty member as to the success of the project with the method of evaluation used to measure that success.

Results show the following broad categories of objectives were subscribed to by faculty working on fellowships: individualized learning, "compact" learning, development of complementary course materials, increasing comprehension, cookbook techniques, improvement of attitude, remedial work, and course development, (open-entry, open-exit). The remaining objectives were scattered in purpose

ranging from production of video tape for dramatization of a concept to credit by examination. Appendix 6 displays a more detailed list of the objectives reported by instructors. Clearly, these objectives are consonant with the philosophy of the Coast Community College District regarding innovation.

The criterion used by most instructors to measure attainment of these objectives was written and/or verbal student evaluations. No specific results were reported, but responses indicated that students on the whole performed better and appreciated the flexibility offered. All but three of the returned questionnaires reported the projects successful as measured by having had the desired impact on the students, higher level of achievement by students, and improvement of retention on examinations.

Interviews with students generally tended to support this conclusion. However, some expressed negative views. Some students felt the audio-tutorial labs were too mechanized and impersonal.

Informal evaluations performed within divisions in past years revealed that the audio-tutorial courses tended to spread students out. Efforts have been made to remedy the situation, however, more flexibility was added to remedy this weakness. Motivation seems a key factor here. Given the flexibility of the programs, motivated students will, in general, do better.

Other criteria used by instructors to measure achievement and retention was the result of examinations. A large portion reported an "increase in student understanding and progress." This is a more

reliable method of evaluation when paired with student evaluations but should be strengthened by giving a pre-test followed by a post-test. Ideally, a control group should be used.

A third method of evaluation was amount of usage. Question 9 asked instructors to estimate the number of students involved in their project. The mean and median students were 191 and 100 respectively. The semester average was 51. If we consider only project completions as reported by questionnaires, we arrive at a conservative figure of roughly 9,000 students involved in projects to date. The data displayed in Tables 6 and 7 support the estimates given by instructors. The tabulated figures were derived from records kept in the Media and Computing Centers. But note that the estimates provided by the instructors and the tabulated figures from the two centers account for some overlapping projects leaving others unaccounted for in both sources of information. The main point is this: Some projects resulting from fellowships are indeed used heavily--others very little.

If cost effectiveness is of concern, we can also conservatively state that roughly $20 per student was invested. If we take into account the on-going projects, the number of students they will involve, and the decreasing cost over time figure, the $20 figure should drop dramatically.

The mean and median number of years completed projects have been operational has been reported as 2.5 and 2 years, respectively. Conservative estimates based on returned questionnaires show approximately 123 "project-years" of projects' use.

TABLE 6

Fall, 1975, Computing Center estimated student usage of selected faculty fellowship projects

DISCIPLINE	NUMBER OF STUDENT CONTACTS	NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS
Anatomy	382	350
Chemistry	156	190
English	400	314
Math	1,360	1,456
Nursing	208	270
TOTALS	2,506	2,580

TABLE 7

Fall, 1975, Media Center estimated student usage of selected faculty fellowship projects

DISCIPLINE	NUMBER OF STUDENT CONTACTS	NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS
Accounting	27	36
Anatomy/Phys	45	45
Economics	18	18
German	125	117
Humanities	108	126
Philosophy	9	9
Shorthand West I	252	315
Shorthand West II	99	153
Sociology	9	9
TOTALS	693	828

The most popular media used to diversify approach to learning were video tapes and sound-on-slides. The computer was next. Overhead transparencies and syllabus writing rounded out this preferred group of media.

By diversification, instructors usually meant (a) individualized instruction (e.g., computer-assisted), (b) flexibility of time--students can view programs practically at any time convenient to them as often as they want, and (c) complementation of lecture with simulation and/or visual effects. One of the respondents who claimed no diversified approach was achieved in reality did; for it allowed students to start and stop missed lectures.

It has been argued that the Faculty Fellowship Program is also a faculty development whereby instructors change their own views on approaches to teaching. Several items in the questionnaire dealt with this point. About two-thirds indicated that, in general, working on a faculty fellowship did change the instructor's approach to teaching. Responses indicated that faculty have become more concerned with individual problems of students, the varied possibilities of media to enrich and complement course offering, needed improvement in the open lab approach used in certain courses, and in general made faculty much more aware of the possibilities of using the various media. On the other hand, those that reported not being affected by the program pointed out that in essence the project results were used to free them of the more pedantic objectives in their courses. But this too can be interpreted as having changed the instructor's approach to teaching. So that, in general, we must conclude the projects, more

than is indicated by the responses, have acted as a growth for faculty as well as a help for students.

The next question deals with generalizability. That is, how many instructors in the same discipline where the project was executed used the project for their own students even though they may not have been involved in the development of the fellowship. Results of the questionnaire show that very few of the projects generalized to other faculty members. This is a serious flaw in the program, yet, a difficult one to improve. Given the individuality and different philosophy of education of instructors even within a discipline, generalizability of projects becomes difficult to achieve. Very often instructors will apply for a fellowship without consulting other faculty members and many times without even consulting the division chairperson. Upon completion of the project little is known of the project (its purpose and objectives) by the instructor's colleagues.

There are ways to improve even this situation. To gain more input and coordination, I suggest that before a faculty fellowship is approved by the reviewing committee, the application be routed first through the division chairperson and then to faculty members in that discipline (or vice versa). There should be an open invitation to other colleagues in that discipline to join in the development of that fellowship.

An interesting statistic gleaned from the questionnaire dealt with questions 14 and 15. Here faculty were asked to estimate the length of time the project lasted from approval to completion and

whether the demand on their time to work on the project was shorter or longer than they had estimated in the application. The average time from approval to completion was 9.4 months. An overwhelming number of respondees reported the project took much longer than originally estimated. This is not a surprising result, innovation can be a time-consuming, expensive endeavor. Private industry has been known to spend an incredible amount of time and funds to produce innovative methods of instruction.

Several questions dealt with the need for revision of completed projects and involved cost. Two-thirds of the faculty polled indicated that some type of revision of the project should be pursued, and (not necessarily the same) two thirds indicated that they were willing to be involved in the revision process. A small number of instructors reported that they are presently (and without additional funding) constantly revising their projects.

Revision and continuous updating of fellowship projects is an important aspect in the success of the program. Perusal of the projects shows that those that are being revised are the same projects being used most heavily. Future policy on fellowships should encourage re-eximination either through extended funding or through an original commitment in the fellowship application. Just as course lecture notes and objectives need to be updated periodically, fellowship projects must be changed as the need arises. This is another weak point in the fellowship program. There is not enough revision and continuous updating of the already established fellowships.

We conclude this section with some open-ended comments solicited by the questionnaire on the instructor's view of the Faculty Fellowship Program. Polled faculty responding to the questionnaire see the fellowship program as having changed, to some extent, their philosophy of education. It has stimulated some instructors to try new ideas by providing the supplies, technical help, and other materials necessary in order to bring innovation into the learning process. Great emphasis was given to the availability of funds, supplies, and technical help such as the programming and video-audio lab technicians. Appendix 7 lists in more detail faculty comments on the projects. We include here only some of those quoted to indicate the overwhelming acceptance of the program. "The fellowship has changed my whole philosophy of education." "Great program--stimulated faculty to try new ideas." "I really think the fellowships are excellent ideas by giving direction, a time deadline, and material and necessary lab assistants." ". . .is about the best way I know of at this time to motivate these students to study." "The fellowship program has been very important to me giving me the opportunity to try different media and solve some classroom problems." "Appreciated the opportunity for learning both for us and for the students." "Faculty fellowship project gave me a chance to start a much needed and much used program." ". . .in serious trouble without this resource."

Not all reactions from faculty were on the positive side. Here are some comments that indicate work needs to be done to improve the program. "Would never sign up for a faculty fellowship project again.

The pressure of trying to complete the project by a set date was terribly distracting to me." "It's all computer-based learning! The faculty are turned off. It was once thought of as creative, now it's simply a dollar saver for machine operations." ". . .too time consuming--too much trouble." "I learned from this experience that concepts are extremely difficult to project on the big screen."

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The strong points of the Faculty Fellowship Program have been amply displayed in this report. Data and interviews clearly indicate that many students have benefited, and will continue to benefit, from the expanded pedagogical horizon due to the Faculty Fellowship Program. Many of the faculty members involved have also grown by becoming more aware of individual differences in students and the possibility offered by technology to meet these differences.

The weak points were also outlined and are summarized as follows:

1. Team participation on fellowships should be encouraged. Data indicates that projects worked on by a single instructor are not used by colleagues in the same discipline. Often the instructor in charge tends to tailor-make the project to suit only his own objectives and method of teaching.

2. An exclusive "faculty fellowship club" seems to have formed whereby membership in the club increases the probability of funding. To cultivate new ideas, new people should be encouraged to apply.

3. Along these same lines, some divisions and/or disciplines have been funded more heavily than others. As in 2 above, an effort should be made to encourage other disicplines to participate.

4. A line should be drawn here on further inquiries into the status of fellowships awarded prior to 1975. There have been repeated shotgun requests. The same instructors usually respond but even they are becoming more and more anatagonistic toward status inquiries. A formal, definite method of reporting--with clout--should be instituted in future fellowship applications.

5. Students' criticism of fellowship projects (which perforce extend to other non-traditional methods of instruction) indicate a real need for on-going revision of programs. A recurring complaint is that the same "bugs" reappear (e.g., wrong answers in CAI program, quality of communication on audio-tapes). Fellowship project programs, as do textbooks and lecture notes, need constant revision for meaningful communication with students.

6. Every fellowship project should be held accountable for (a) a periodic progress report, (b) a completion report, and (c) an evaluation report. The evaluation report will vary according to the goals and objectives of the project. The instructor(s) in charge should be encouraged to seek the assistance of the director of research to set up a design the instructor deems satisfactory for measuring the effectiveness of the project.

The consensus in the Coast Community College District Faculty Fellowship Program is that it is an unquestionnable success. I strongly

recommend its continuance or that of a revised program that will allow instructors on both campuses to pursue innovative ideas which might otherwise never come to fruition. Few community colleges in the nation have been able to provide such an opportunity to its staff and students. The results of this effort is clear. The Coast Community College District is a recognized national leader in the field of innovative instruction. Visitors are invariably (but also naively) amazed at the existence of such a program and can only dream about instituting a program at their own school. But they mistake the financial reality at CCCD as the key to the success of the program. This is not the case. Financial backing is necessary but not sufficient. The Rand Corporation has conducted studies which show that motivation is an important factor in the success of the implementation of innovative programs. Strong staff commitment and support from district officials, Rand claims, is an important prerequisite to success. Also, high teacher morale and willingness to do extra work are important factors in the final outcome of projects.

The present report indicates that both of these requirements as well as financial clout have been present in the CCCD fellowship program. But Rand also stresses that for a successful program, projects need to fit the school's goals. If a project is pursued opportunistically and is forced to fit the mold of the school and its objectives, success is not likely. Conversely, the school must also accommodate to the project. For the Faculty Fellowship Program in the Coast District, this is a philosophically gray area and has led to considerable criticism. Future policy on faculty fellowships must take this "mutual adaptation" into consideration.

What steps should be taken at this time to improve an in-need-of-revision-but-otherwise-successful program? This report has already pointed to some areas that need improvement. Suggestions have been offered. But one important problem has not been addressed squarely: How can the long-range goals of the District and campus be made consonant with those of faculty applying for fellowships and conversely? It is not enough for District to say it is dedicated to innovative approaches to learning. It must clearly state the type of innovation it is looking for. Faculty is expert in its discipline, not necessarily in learning theory or educational technology.

Stronger leadership is needed to direct implementation of long-range District and campus goals. If open-entry, open-exit modules of instruction is a long-range goal, faculty fellowship policy should so state. Then, faculty members interested in pursuing this innovation can be encouraged to apply.

This structural change must be instituted in the revised fellowship program. Conversely, fellowship program policy should allow for faculty-initiated ideas and be willing to fund those ideas. Up to now, District has, indeed, heavily supported faculty ideas. This support should be continued in the revised program--but with stronger emphasis on accountability. Not accountability that smacks of liability, but explanation of strengths and weaknesses that may lead to more effective programs.

The revised fellowship program, then, can be strengthened through better communication and a symbiotic relationship of goals. A more

coordinated effort toward the pursuit of innovative methods of instruction will, hopefully, be the result.

COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Faculty Fellowship Program

Spring 1975

The Faculty Fellowship Program solicits and encourages developmental work on the part of faculty members toward improving learning experiences in our colleges. To this end, the District establishes a fund each year to finance educational development projects conducted by faculty members either individually or in groups. These funds may be used to provide supplies, minor equipment, and assistance to faculty members with projects upon which they desire to work. The funds may also be used to provide time necessary for the execution of the projects. Such time may take several forms, depending upon the requirements of the specific project. It may, for example, involve time released from a faculty member's regular assignment or it may involve overtime pay.

There are no specific regulations regarding fellowship applications. All new and exciting plans will be considered. Guidelines which strengthen plans have been evolved and include the following.

1. Affects the mainstream of a course or program.

2. Potentially useful in other programs or courses, i.e., multiplier effect.

3. Deploys strategies designed to meet objectives within a course or program in more effective ways than those used in the past.

4. Requests support for a new effort.

5. Considers numbers of students affected and longevity of use.

6. Ascertains that the materials are not available from other sources at a lesser cost.

Proposal Preparation

Faculty members define the nature of the project and request support for a Faculty Fellowship using an application form (copy attached).

Office of Educational Planning and Development Staff (Jack McGill, Tom Gripp, Bernie Luskin) and Hayden Williams at Golden West College or Leo LaJeunesse at Orange Coast College are available and offer to assist in developing proposals. Division chairmen should be apprised of proposals coming from their divisions.

Orange Coast College proposals are submitted to Leo LaJeunesse. Proposals from Golden West College should be submitted to Hayden Williams. THE SPRING SEMESTER DEADLINE IS JANUARY 30, 1975.

Proposals submitted this spring (February 1) may be for projects to be carried out during the summer or next fall semester. If the project involves no changes in current assignment or reassignment arrangements are made, operation commences immediately on approval during the semester in which the proposal is submitted. For example, a project approved this spring may commence this spring if it involves no changes in the faculty member's regular assignment or other arrangements have been made with the Academic Dean.

Questions to be answered when preparing a proposal are listed below:

1. What are the objectives of the project?

Describe what the project will accomplish. If, for example, the project involves developing an independent study course, in say, chemistry, making use of laboratory assignments, simulated experiments on a computer terminal, viewing film strips and movies, and reading text materials, say so. If it is a research project, describe what is to be found out.

2. In your opinion, how will the project improve learning?

Indicate the ways in which learning will be improved over past practices. Will more students be served? Will subject matter breadth and/or depth be increased? Will students' total experience at college be improved?

3. What is the context of the proposed project?

Describe other efforts related to the work you want to do. These efforts may have taken place at your college or somewhere else. Explain how your work will make use of or will improve upon previous work done. If previous work you have examined is unsatisfactory for your instructional needs, explain why. How will your work be different?

4. Outline the step-by-step procedures you will use in implementing your project.

Outline the steps to be followed in executing the project. Be specific; leave as little as possible to the imagination of the reviewing committee.

5. Estimated Time Schedule

Fill in the blanks. These dates will be viewed as estimates and target goals rather than as deadline commitments.

6. Please describe the final product of this project.

Describe the final results of the project. If the results comprise a video tape, for example, describe the content of the tape and how it might be used. If the results are to be in the form of a research report, describe the nature of the report and the subjects to which the report is addressed.

7. How will you evaluate the results of your project?

Describe how you will determine the degree to which your resulting product is successful at fulfilling its designed functions. The Office of Educational Planning and Development will be happy to help if you like. Call Jack McGill at 556-5608.

8. What are the personnel requirements?

Indicate the amount of time needed by all personnel involved with the project. Also indicate how the time is to be accounted for: overtime, released time for regular assignments, extra pay, summer job, or whatever.

9. What are the operating expenses?

Provide a budget showing the needs of the project for personnel, supplies, travel, minor equipment, and miscellaneous expenses. This budget should show only figures that are not included in the regular district budget and that are pertinent only to the project. Extra pay for certificated personnel should be calculated at $62 per day (regular per-diem rate for eight-hour day). Student lab assistant rates are $1.90 (less than 90 hours) and $2.10 (90 or more hours) per hour.

Review Procedure

When completed, applications for Faculty Fellowship should be submitted to the President (Golden West College) or the Dean of Instruction (Orange Coast College). Applications will be reviewed and evaluated by appropriate college groups. Applications approved in this manner will be forwarded for consideration by the District.

Upon approval, funds will be allocated to projects and work may begin as scheduled. Applications failing approval may be resubmitted.

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation of Faculty Fellowship proposals is subjective and is based primarily on the overall anticipated quality of the proposed work and the degree to which the project will likely meet its stated objectives. A number of implicit questions have repeatedly arisen in the minds of those reviewing proposals. Among others, these include:

1. How innovative is the project?

2. To what degree will it extend instructors to more students, i.e., increase instructor-to-student contact?

3. Is the resulting product available commercially?

4. Is the project creative?

5. Is the final product worth the investment?

These are not by any means the only criteria used to evaluate Fellowship Proposals. They should be viewed as examples of criteria that have been mentioned during proposal review sessions. As each project is reviewed independently and subjectively, no formal or "official" criteria have been articulated.

Funding

Each school year, the District will provide an amount of funds to be used for Faculty Fellowships. Where possible, external sources of funds will be sought so as to maximize the number of approved projects that can be funded. To this end, it behooves those who prepare project applications to consult with the Office of Educational Planning and Development in order that the District be fully prepared to seek funding from any source.

Completed Projects

After your project is completed, you will be asked to describe the final product in terms of its major objectives. As the project develops, you should give consideration to such questions as "How well have the objectives of the project been met?" "Does the project meet the needs it was intended to meet?" "How is the project received by students or by others directly involved with its execution?" "What should be done to improve the project?" "What needs to be done to make it possible for others to benefit from the execution of the project; that is, what is required for its widespread implementation?"

COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

FACULTY FELLOWSHIP PROPOSAL

Name of Project_____

Date of Submission_____

College_____ Division_____

Name of Faculty Member in Charge_____

1. Project Description

(a) Objectives:

(b) How project will improve learning:

(c) Step-by-step procedures in executing project:

(d) Final product:

2. Time Schedule

Project will begin on _____ and will be
(Date)

completed by _____.
(Date)

3. How will you determine the degree to which the objectives of your project have been achieved?

4. Personnel Requirements

(a) Certificated Faculty (Describe duties and time requirements. If substitute teachers are to provide released time, be sure to check with the Dean of Instruction at OCC and the Dean of Academic Affairs at GWC before submitting the proposal.)

(b) Consultants (Describe duties and necessary fees.)

(c) Laboratory Assistants (Describe duties and number of hours required.)

5. Budget

1. Personnel

a. Payment to certificated faculty _____

b. Payment to consultants _____

c. Payment to laboratory assistants _____

d. Cost of substitute teaching _____

2. Minor Equipment (List specific items) _____

3. Travel _____

4. Supplies _____

5. Miscellaneous _____

TOTAL BUDGET $_____

FACULTY FELLOWSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions as comprehensively as possible, quantifying wherever possible. Return to the Research Office by October 16, 1975.

1. Title of the project you directed: _____

2. Did you complete the project? _____ Approximate date: _____

3. Did you file a completion report with Hayden Williams or the Office of Educational Development (District Office)? _____ If not, why? _____

4. How long has the project been in use? _____

5. If your project is no longer in use or has never been used, please explain.

6. If applicable and possible, estimate the number of students who were supposed to be involved _____ how many were actually involved in the project 1) at the beginning _____ and 2) at the end _____ and the approximate number of hours one student spends on your project each semester: _____

7. What are some general objectives you intended the student to achieve?

8. Did your project have the desired impact on the student? _____ How did it change the learning activities of the students? _____

9. Because of the project, in your estimation, is the retention rate higher among students who used it? _____ Please explain why you think so.

10. Do you believe student behavior, as defined by achievement and/or attitude toward the subject, improved as a result of your project? _____ Why? _____

11. What was the primary medium used in the project? Explain or give an example. _____

12. Did the project introduce a diversified approach to learning in the course? Please explain. _____

13. Did your faculty fellowship change your approach to teaching? Specifically? In general? _____

14. Was the demand on your time to work on the project shorter or longer than what you had estimated in the application? _____

15. Estimate the length of time the project lasted from approval to completion? _____

16. How many colleagues use your project for their students? _____

17. How did you evaluate your project? _____

18. Do you consider the project successful? _____

19. Does the project need revision at this point? _____ How much would it cost? _____

20. Would you be willing to revise or extend the project? _____

Please add any comments you have on the Faculty Fellowship Program, anonymously if you like. Give me nitty-gritties please!

OBJECTIVES REPORTED BY INSTRUCTORS

- teach students techniques used by a variety of selected Southern California artists and designers

- CAI programs were written to remediate specific problems students had in English courses

- develop a computer program to randomly generate tests for Math 005 and develop a plan for a workable open-entry open-exit course in Math 005.

- produce a film for philosophy class to present both Plato's views on art and the meaphysics of The One

- have topic oriented slide-audio packages that would be independent of text for student use in mastering topic or concept

- to have the student learn quicker and easier some of the more difficult-to-learn aspects of technical illustration

- learn more in less time about electro-mechanical drafting

- hoped that the students would be able to do lab work with a minimum of instructor assistance

- learn film making techniques; understand effect of film on their lives

- self-help in open lab; visual instruction on new equipment; independent instruction on new processes

- to complete a step-by-step procedure in color printing; complete assignment with samples of their work; understand the color process

- step-by-step operation of graphic arts equipment; identification of equipment parts; understand the history of printing from earliest methods of the modern equipment of today

- learn how to write acceptable, sophisticated sentences.

- learn basic grammar problems in sentence structure; know reasons for and identify functions of words and word groups

- a better understanding of the principles of physics; increased skill in solving problems of physics

- design a teaching plan for individualized instruction and open-entry, open-exit method of teaching typing; to write behavior objectives for the courses; to design the room to fit the new method of instruction

- to polish teaching plan and behavioral objectives; to select and purchase equipment for lab; to produce media for the lab

- to develop a detailed course syllabus for students to follow in order to run the classes of Sec. Sci. 039 and 040 on an individualized open-entry, open-ext basis; to develop the necessary audio-visuals to go with such a course 1) course syllabus, 2) videotapes (3), 2) sound-slide packages, 3) sound-slide packages (6), 4) computer programs (2), 5) computer programs and microfiche (1), 6) handouts (many including art work by AV)

- clearer concept of the scope of the subject matter; more efficient study methods; integration of practical and theoretical aspects

- to produce more visual approaches in specific areas

- to be able to self-pace learning nursing skills; practice skills under supervision and guidance; provide opportunity to review skills, when needed

- to gain objective, medically sound information on problems related to personal and community health; to learn where to seek additional help that is accurate in medical procedures; to develop an interest in personal and community health problems; knowledge that in dealing with health and medical information, any subject can be discussed objectively and without embarrassament

- development of an appreciation of the worth of one's physical and emotional self; to have use of another form of audio-visual learning experiences

- a setting of environment while focusing attention on music, 12 carrousels of slides with accompanying tapes

- accommodate individual student learning needs when he is ready to remediate, as opposed to a fixed schedule, for accommodating a group of students; assist student in attaining remediation to "expected level" as specified in course objectives

- implement evaluation tools to meet the minimum acceptable level of performance as required for each course objective in maternity nursing; individualize learning pace of students; provide immediate feedback to questions as student works through the objective to be achieved; measure students' achievement accurately in completion stage of enrollment in maternity nursing courses

- use an audio tape in conjunction with the course

- present mini "lecutres" on video tape for Math 005 and Math 120

- credit by exam

- I planned 5 parts; I finished one. The general objective of the first part was to introduce the student to metaphor, to examine metaphor logically, to demonstrate the affective values of metaphor, and to interest the student in following the subject further.

- Our primary purpose was to examine the material (software) we had and to buy, develop, and suggest for development new material. This material was to help students with particular writing problems. In addition to this, we spent a lot of time in committee meetings developing the course itself, working out logistics, and defending the approach. The objectives were decided by the department.

- I wanted him to pay close attention to the form of the footnote and to realize what information was to be documented.

- to organize in one package the materials needed for additional response sheets for Medical-Surgical Nursing I. The original was 353 pages long.

- the student model; be able to watch lectures that he missed or were difficult for him to understand; increased learning

- learning of facts relating to constants in obstetrical nursing as bones of the fetal skull, maternal pelvis characteristics, relationships between the two, etc. Unit objectives are listed on programs for self-teaching.

- how to use the Readers' Guide as a source for research papers or any general library use

- to create appropriate software to individualize instruction in beginning typing; video cassettes to cover information that all students need to learn to type; keyboard presentation and techniques; manuscripts, correspondence, tabulation, typewriter parts

- achieve higher success rate in shorthand; obtain better understanding of phonics

- foundation of shorthand; gain a recognition of English language sounds; gain a recognition of shorthand vowel and selected word beginning and ending symbols

- achieve higher success rate in shorthand; achieve a better foundation in shorthand theory; gain ability to write more legible shorthand outlines; gain the ability to write a minimum shorthand speed; achieve a higher level of self-confidence in his ability to acquire greater shorthand skill

- achieve a high success rate in shorthand; gain the ability to write a faster shorthand speed; gain basic transcription skills; achieve a firmer foundation in shorthand theory through review

- modular concepts are to be developed in slide-audio tape packages and in video components which can be used by students enrolled in the course or by students needing review of these concepts for another discipline

- familiarity with basic chemistry lab techniques; safe methods to be used in conducting laboratory experiments; greater understanding of the concepts being reinforced by experiments; coordination of safety, lab techniques, and theory by use of video tapes and coordinated written materials.

- increased vocabulary level; increased comprehension level; increased speed; increased ability to deal with textbooks; increased ability to handle all study-type experiences

- develop an understanding of the role of the historian in the writing of history; affect a change in attitudes about the role of the historian

- allow students to proceed into either chemistry or biology oriented areas; allow students a real choice between these major areas (chamistry and biology); allow students to proceed at their own pace

- learn German better

FACULTY COMMENTS ON THE PROJECTS

- Great idea! Continue it. It contributes mightily to the college.

- I learned from this experience that concepts are extremely difficult to project on the big screen.

- Great program--stimulates faculty to try new ideas.

- It's all computer-based learning! The faculty are turned off. It was once thought of as creative, now it's simply a dollar saver for machine operators.

- A must to be continued. Faculty should be approved subject to division priorities and accountable to get projects completed and usable.

- Involves mucho work, but it is about the best way I know of at this time to motivate these students to study!

- I really think the fellowships are excellent ideas by giving direction, a time deadline, and the materials and necessary lab assistants. Most of us simply have no clerical help or supply budgets to do any job adequately let alone a major undertaking.

- I feel that the best part was to have laboratory assistants who could do the typing, leg work, etc. after all the initial groundwork was completed. Otherwise, there would not be sufficient time to do justice to the projects.

- I spent much more time than estimated. It is the best bargain the District ever received for its monies.

- I appreciated the opportunity for learning, both for us and for the students. Compensation was fair. Experienced problems with the Computer Center was frustrating at times.

- My program would be in serious trouble without this resource.

- For me personally, the faculty fellowship project gave me a chance to start a much needed and much used program which otherwise I probably would not have undertaken.

- The pressure of trying to complete a project by a set date was terribly distracting to me. I now feel that I have some understanding of how to develop individualized programs and would prefer doing so on my own at my pace.

- It has changed my whole philosophy of education.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

42 JAN 23 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES